

### REMARKS

Claims 1-17 were pending. Claims 1, 6, 7, 10, 13, 14 and 17 have been amended. Claims 18-19 have been added. Claims 1-19 are now pending, of which claims 1, 7, 10, and 13 are independent. Reconsideration of the action mailed February 10, 2004, is requested in light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks. No new matter is added.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 7, 10, and 13-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Microsoft Word: User's Guide, Version 6.0, 1993-1994 ("Word 6.0"). The Examiner rejected claims 3-6, 8-9, 11-12, and 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Word 6.0 in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,175,806 ("Muskovitz"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

#### **Section 102(b) rejections**

Claim 1 stands rejected as anticipated by Word 6.0. As amended, claim 1 requires that the page structural element be moved without deformation and that "only a single one of the plurality of second attraction points is attractive to snap the page structural element to a first attraction point while said page structural element is being moved." Word 6.0 does not disclose moving, without deformation, a page structural element having a plurality of attraction points where only a single attraction point is selected as attractive.

The Examiner states that pages 387 and 392 of Word 6.0 disclose claim 1. Page 387 of Word 6.0 describes reshaping a drawing object by selecting a single handle of the object and dragging the handle to reshape the drawing object. Page 387 does not describe selecting a single handle on an object as an attraction point and then moving the object without deformation. Further, page 392 of Word 6.0 describes modifying a grid layout and the snap-to-grid feature. However, the discussion of the snap-to-grid describes all corners of a drawing object as snapping to the grid, not the selection of a single attraction point. Because Word 6.0 does not disclose moving, without deformation, a page structural element having a plurality of attraction points with only a single attraction point selected as attractive, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1, as well as claims 2-6, which depend from claim 1, are in condition for allowance.

Claims 7 and 10 stand rejected as anticipated by Word 6.0. Claims 7 and 10, as amended, recite "setting only a single second attraction point nearest to said cursor in an attractive state" and then "moving said page structural element without deformation." For at least the reasons set forth with respect to claim 1, claims 7 and 10, as well as claims 8-9 and 11-12, which depend from claims 7 and 10 respectively, are in condition for allowance.

Claim 13 stands rejected as anticipated by Word 6.0. Claim 13, as amended, requires that the position of a page structural element be adjusted without deformation and that "only a single one of the plurality of second attraction points is attractive to snap the page structural element to a first attraction point while said page structural element is being moved." For at least the reasons set forth with respect to claim 1, claim 13, as well as claims 14-17, which depend from claim 13, are also in condition for allowance.

#### **Section 103(a) rejections**

Dependent claim 6 stands rejected as unpatentable over Word 6.0 in view of Muskovitz. Claim 6 recites that "said attraction state control activates only a single second attraction point nearest to said cursor attractive when said page structural element is being held by said movement device."

The Examiner contends that page 287 of Word 6.0 discloses claim 6. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Page 287 of Word 6.0 does disclose using a cursor to select a single handle on a drawing object and dragging the handle in order to resize or reshape the drawing object. However, Word 6.0 does not disclose using a cursor to select only a closest attraction point of a page structural element as attractive when the page structural element is held by the movement device. Further Word 6.0 does not disclose a movement device for holding a page structural element and moving the page structural element without deformation while only a single attraction point of the page structural element is attractive. For at least the foregoing reasons, as well as the reasons set forth with respect to claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 6 is allowable.

Dependant claim 17 stands rejected as unpatentable over Word 6.0 in view of Muskovitz. Claim 17 recites "the processor is configured to makes only the second attraction point nearest to

said cursor attractive when the cursor is positioned inside the page structural element frame.”

For at least the reasons set forth with respect to claims 1 and 6, claim 17 is also allowable.

#### **New Claims**

Claims 18 and 19 have been added. Claim 18 depends from claim 1 and requires that the page structural element is demarcated by a frame. For at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1, claim 18 is also allowable. Claim 19 depends from claim 18 and requires that only a single second attraction point is activated as attractive when a cursor is positioned inside the page structural element frame. For at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1, claim 19 is also allowable.

Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 10 May, 2004

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Brian J. Gustafson  
Reg. No. 52,978

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
500 Arguello Street, Suite 500  
Redwood City, California 94063  
Telephone: (650) 839-5070  
Facsimile: (650) 839-5071